



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/820,882

04/09/2004

Kenzo Sakurai

Q79368

9264

23373 7590 03/20/2008
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

PADEN, CAROLYN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/820,882	Applicant(s) SAKURAI, KENZO	
	Examiner Carolyn A. Paden	Art Unit 1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smits (4,359,481) as further evidenced by Fessmann (1,137,637) for reasons of record.

Smits discloses liquid smoke concentrate. The concept of treating fish with treating fish is disclosed at column 3, line 39. The liquid smoke is made (column 3, lines 62-68 and column 4) by creating smoke and then removing the first and second tar fractions by cooling the smoke to a temperature of 150-200C and then to 80C to 120C. Smits uses a Fessmann smoke generator (see example 1), which uses steam extraction of smoke components. After cooling to room temperature, the non-condensable gases are separated off. Then the pH of the smoke is adjusted with water, acid or base. The claims appear to differ from Smits in the creation of a smoke dried fish but smoked foods are typically dried foods. To use the smoke of Smits in a dried fish formulation would have been an obvious matter of choice with regard to the particular extent of

preservation desired in the fish product. It is also appreciated that fish fillet is not mentioned but fish is typically prepared in fillets. Dipping fish in liquid smoke would have been an obvious way of introducing the liquid smoke to the fish.

Applicant argues that air is introduced in the smoke generator of Fessmann. This has been considered but is not persuasive. Neutral gas is cited as an obvious alternative to air in Fessmann.

Applicant argues that the reference do not show “removing unnecessary substance” from the smoking material. This is disagreed with as note example 1, wherein tar fractions are removed by fractional condensation. Introduction of air would not have been expected during the fractional condensation process.

Claims 3-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smit as further evidenced by Fessmann as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Kenzo (PAJ 10-179016).

The claims appear to differ from Smits in the recitation of the use of perfusion through a blood vessel as a way of adding liquid smoke to the fish. Kenzo teaches that perfusion as a way to distribute antioxidants to fish. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the

perfusion system of Kenzo in the fish processing of Smits in order to preserve the fish with liquid smoke. It is appreciated that the particular way that the liquid smoke is created in claim 7 is not mentioned but no unobvious difference is seen from the smoke of Smits and the smoke of the claims. It is also appreciated that the use of an anti-coagulant is not mentioned in claim 8 but if one of ordinary skill in the art wanted to completely flush the blood from a fish, it would be obvious to use an anti-coagulant in the perfusion system. The preserved fish would still be suitable for consumption by rodent pests. It is also appreciated that frozen fish is not mentioned but to freezing is an obvious way to preserve the shelf-life of fish.

Applicants' arguments are directed to independent claim 1 and so no arguments need to be addressed for this rejection.

Claims 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to use an anti-coagulant to achieve the desired goal. This has been considered but is not persuasive. There is no direction in the specification as to the amount or kind of anti-coagulant that would be useful in the fish process of the claims. Applicants' references are helpful but do not provide the American, non-Japanese literate reader with achieving this understanding.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn A Paden whose telephone number is (571) 272-1403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano, can be reached by dialing 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Carolyn Paden/

Primary Examiner 1794

Application/Control Number: 10/820,882
Art Unit: 1794

Page 7

.